

BG J. Franklin Bell and the Practice of Operational Art in the Philippines, 1901-1902

**A Monograph
by
MAJ Brian E McCarthy
United States Army**



**School of Advanced Military Studies
United States Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas**

AY 2011

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</p>				
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01-12-2011	2. REPORT TYPE Monograph	3. DATES COVERED (From - To) JAN 2011 – DEC 2011		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE BG J. Franklin Bell and the Practice of Operational Art in the Philippines, 1901-1902			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJ Brian E. McCarthy, United States Army			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS) 250 Gibbon Avenue Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301			8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT U.S. Army commanders seek to balance the requirements to conduct offensive, defensive and stability operations simultaneously. Within this framework, commanders have also had to balance the conduct of traditional military actions and non-military activities. In order to do so effectively commanders employ operational art. The forthcoming Army Doctrinal Publication, <i>Unified Land Operations</i> presents the “principle that operational art is the connection between strategic objectives and tactical actions, and provides a common construct for organizing military operations.” This manual defines operational art as “the pursuit of strategic objectives, in whole or in part, through the arrangement of tactical actions in time, space, and purpose.” While the Army did not introduce the concept of operational art into its doctrine until 1986, commanders had previously applied it. The United States’ war in the Philippines from 1899-1902, provides one example of a conflict in which commanders had to conduct combat and stability operations simultaneously, and the campaign of Brigadier General J. Franklin Bell is an example of how a commander employed operational art to do so. General Bell’s campaign in the Batangas Province demonstrates how a commander employed operational art to arrange traditional military and non-military tactical actions in pursuit of strategic objectives.				
15. SUBJECT TERMS J. Franklin Bell, Philippines, Batangas, Operational Art				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT (U)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES (U)	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)			c. THIS PAGE (U)

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

MAJ Brian E. McCarthy

Title of Monograph: BG J. Franklin Bell and the Practice of Operational Art in the Philippines, 1901-1902.

Approved by:

Thomas A. Bruscino, Ph.D.

Monograph Director

John A. Kelly, COL

Second Reader

Thomas C. Graves, COL, IN

Director,
School of Advanced
Military Studies

Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.

Director,
Graduate Degree
Programs

Disclaimer: Opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed or implied within are solely those of the author, and do not represent the views of the US Army School of Advanced Military Studies, the US Army Command and General Staff College, the United States Army, the Department of Defense, or any other US government agency. Cleared for public release: distribution unlimited.

Abstract

BG J. Franklin Bell and the Practice of Operational Art in the Philippines, 1901-1902 by MAJ Brian E. McCarthy, USA, 50 pages.

U.S. Army commanders seek to balance the requirements to conduct offensive, defensive and stability operations simultaneously. Within this framework, commanders have also had to balance the conduct of traditional military actions and non-military activities. In order to do so effectively commanders employ operational art. The forthcoming Army Doctrinal Publication, *Unified Land Operations* presents the “principle that operational art is the connection between strategic objectives and tactical actions, and provides a common construct for organizing military operations.” This manual defines operational art as “the pursuit of strategic objectives, in whole or in part, through the arrangement of tactical actions in time, space, and purpose. While the Army did not introduce the concept of operational art into its doctrine until 1986, commanders had previously applied it. The United States’ war in the Philippines from 1899-1902, provides one example of a conflict in which commanders had to conduct combat and stability operations simultaneously, and the campaign of Brigadier General J. Franklin Bell is an example of how a commander employed operational art to do so. General Bell’s campaign in the Batangas Province demonstrates how a commander employed operational art to arrange traditional military and non-military tactical actions in pursuit of strategic objectives.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
THE PHILIPPINE WAR OF 1899-1902	11
BELL'S CAMPAIGN	21
CONCLUSION	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	51

INTRODUCTION

“The study of the Philippine War can offer great insight into the complexities of localized guerrilla war and indigenous resistance to foreign control.”¹

—Brian McAllister Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*

Throughout Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom, U.S. Army commanders have sought balance between conducting offensive, defensive and stability operations. Within this framework, commanders have also had to balance the conduct of traditional military actions and non-military activities. While the operational level leadership of the U.S. Army included veterans of operations in Panama, Grenada, Desert Shield/Storm, Bosnia, and Kosovo, these conflicts were primarily either a major combat operation or a stability operation. This meant that most of the Army’s senior leadership did not have experience conducting major combat and stability operations simultaneously. Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom blended elements of both, and required that they be conducted at the same time. However, these are not the first conflicts in which this occurred. The United States’ war in the Philippines from 1899-1902, provides one example of a conflict in which commanders had to conduct combat and stability operations simultaneously.

Unified Land Operations presents the “principle that operational art is the connection between strategic objectives and tactical actions, and provides a common construct for organizing military operations.”² The manual defines operational art as “the pursuit of strategic objectives, in whole or in part, through the arrangement of tactical actions in time, space, and purpose.”³ Not tied to an echelon, by any commander who seeks to achieve a strategic objective himself, or to set

¹ Brian M. Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 328.

² Department of the Army, *Unified Land Operations, Draft 9.6* (Unpublished report, 2011), 1

³ Department of the Army, *Unified Land Operations, Draft 9.6*, 9.

the conditions for it can practice operational art. Commanders who practice operational art effectively create plans that incorporate multiple tactical actions nested in the purpose of doing this. Operational art can be practiced in any type of conflict or military operation. Brigadier General J. Franklin Bell's Philippine campaign of 1901 demonstrates how a commander employed operational art to arrange traditional military and non-military tactical actions in pursuit of strategic objectives.

This monograph will conduct a historic case study of General Bell's 1902 campaign in the Philippines. It applies current concepts and definitions of operational art to General Bell's campaign plan in an effort to analyze how his campaign reflects them. This paper seeks to determine how commanders can apply operational art to generate campaign plans in an environment that includes uncertainty in mission and task. It will demonstrate the timelessness of the concepts of operational art, and illustrate how commanders can conduct operational art and subsequently campaign in any type of conflict. Specifically it will illustrate how commanders have balanced their organization's efforts between combat and stability activities.⁴ It will also demonstrate the importance of linking traditional military activities, such as attacks, raids, and defenses, with non-traditional activities such as civil governance and economic development.

To accomplish this, this monograph compromises four sections. The first section consists of a literature review that will introduce the literature that covers the U.S. Army's campaigns in Luzon. The literature review will also introduce the U.S. Army's doctrine of operational art and its evolution in order to provide a common understanding of operational art. Doctrinal literature and organization theory will provide a common understanding of operational art. The second step will be to provide the situational context that General Bell confronted in 1902. The section will

⁴ The terms major combat and combat operations are often used interchangeably. In the lexicon of *Unified Land Operations*, the term Combined Arms Maneuver is used for these activities. This text also refers to Stability operations as Wide Area Security.

include an introduction to the conflict, as well as what the General Bell's vision of success was. The third section consists of an operational analysis of General Bell's campaign. It will introduce General Bell's campaign plan, and then analyze it using the current elements of operational art. The final section will describe the efficacy of General Bell's plan, draw conclusions, and provide recommendations for further research.

In 2011, the United States Army is conducting simultaneous combat and stability operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Philippines. A century earlier, the Army was conducting similar operations, and it is safe to assume that today's will not be the last conflicts in which the Army will be doing so. Studying General Bell's Philippine campaign can highlight lessons that are relevant to contemporary conflicts as much as to future ones. Viewing his campaign through the lens of operational art will demonstrate how commanders deliberately arrange their unit's activities to reach their objectives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Operational art was not a formalized part of U.S. Army doctrine until the 1980s. However, researchers have shown that it existed before then. This literature review provides two aspects of context for the monograph. It will first introduce the literature surrounding the Philippine War, and then the doctrine and evolution of operational art in the U.S. Army. In order to analyze the campaign of General Bell, it is necessary to have an understanding both of operational art, as the U.S. Army defines it, and the Philippine War.

American history studies often slight the Philippine War of 1899-1902. Sandwiched between the Spanish-American War and World War I, it is often overlooked and often misunderstood as well. Much of this literature written about the U.S. Army's conduct of operations against the Filipino insurgents focuses on the atrocities that were committed during this war, with some authors condemning the Americans and others apologizing or placing the acts

into a more contemporary context. A number of works also discuss the American involvement in the Philippines from a foreign policy perspective. While many of these authors submit that then President McKinley did not offer much in the way of describing his thought process for the United States' involvement in the Philippines, they almost all agree that the notion that the Filipinos were not yet ready for self-rule is a given.

Texas A&M University professor Brian Linn's *The Philippine War: 1899-1902*, provides a comprehensive narration of the war, and is indicative of those authors who focus on the U.S. Army's activities in the Philippines. Professor Linn wrote this book to provide a history of the military's operation in the four years that comprised the conflict. He had identified that the Philippine War had received little attention, and that much of the existing literature focused primarily on torture, war crimes, and population and resource control. Other works in this vein include Linn's earlier work *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War 1899-1902*, David Silbey's *A War of Frontier and Empire*, and Glenn May's *Battle for Batangas*. Mark Moyar also provides historical background in *A Question of Command: Counterinsurgency from the Civil War to Iraq*, focusing on the contributions made by the leaders of the conflict. While introducing the conflict, Moyar focuses on the insurrection phase of the war, specifically on the role that leaders such as Emilio Aguinaldo, and Generals Otis, MacArthur, and Bell played in the conduct of operations. Robert Ramsey provides a significant contribution to the history of the Philippine War with his book *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*. This book, published by the U.S. Army's Combat Studies Institute in 2007, provides case studies designed to evoke parallels between the Philippine War and the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan in order to demonstrate the timelessness of combat and the issues that surround it.

Most of the literature discusses the United States counterinsurgency activities in the Philippines. A group of authors who do so at length begins with Robert Ramsey whose *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, is

another Combat Studies Institute work. Also published in 2007, this book anchors the literature about counterinsurgency on Luzon in the latter part of the conflict. Ramsey introduces General Bell and provides some context of the war, but the bulk of the book is a catalogue of Bell's orders to his brigade. Other works include Andrew Birtle's *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941*, which charts the development of the Army's doctrine and introduces the doctrine with which leaders like Bell were familiar. John Gates focuses on the problems with victory and countering an insurgency in *Schoolbooks and Krags: The United States Army in The Philippines, 1898-1902*, Alfred McCoy discusses this topic as well in *Policing America's Empire*. Professor Anthony James Joes also provides an analysis of the American counterinsurgency campaign in "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines" a chapter in *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, published in 2008. There are also a number of new articles about the American experience in the Philippine War being published as would be expected given the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

The third grouping of literature about the Philippine War provides the strategic context for the conflict. Stanley Karnow introduces his history of the conflict that details not only the actions of the military, but ties it to the events of the Spanish-American War and America's emerging global status. Richard Welch's *Response to Imperialism* and Stuart Miller's *Benevolent Assimilation* also provide foreign policy insight into the war. Leon Wolff's *Little Brown Brother* does so as well using biographies of the characters to provide insight as to their thinking and decisions. Ralph Minger's biography *William Howard Taft and United States' Policy* describes Taft's administration of the Philippines. Minger also discusses Taft's experience in the Philippines and how it contributed to his views on the importance of the islands. Minger also presents one of the primary issues of developing a policy for the Philippines; America knew next to nothing about them. H. Wayne Morgan echoes this with an anecdote in *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*. He writes that President McKinley was as ill prepared as the average American for war in the Philippines and was using a map of the Pacific

from a school textbook to follow Admiral Dewey as he sailed to meet the Spanish Armada in Manila.⁵ Morgan also submits that one of the issues in determining the policies of the Philippine War was that President McKinley did not believe in conducting diplomacy in the press and kept his own counsel, often leaving attendees at meetings guessing as to his true intentions.⁶

The body of literature provides a narrative of the war beginning with activities during the Spanish-American War in 1898. It presents the Philippine War as having three distinct phases. The first is the conflict between the Spanish-American War during which the Filipinos were allied with the United States. In the second phase, the U.S. fought a regular force, the Philippine Army of Liberation, while in the third phase, the guerrilla war, those same Americans fought the guerrilla forces then employed by the Filipinos. It also does a good job of describing the tactical actions taken by the Army throughout the war. An equal body of work sets the strategic context for the Philippine War. While, there is little doubt that the Philippine War was instrumental in the United States emergence as a global power, President McKinley's reserved nature often hampers authors analyzing the war from a policy perspective.

The U.S. Army's capstone manual for operations uses the Joint definition of operational art, defining it as "the application of creative imagination by commanders and staffs-supported by their skill, knowledge, and experience-to design strategies, campaigns, and major operations and organize and employ military forces. Operational art integrates ends, ways, and means across the levels of war."⁷ The forthcoming version of the manual *Unified Land Operations* replaces this somewhat confusing definition with a more succinct one that states that operational art "is the pursuit of strategic objectives, in whole or in part, through the arrangement of tactical actions in

⁵ H. Wayne Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1965), 74.

⁶ Ibid., 75.

⁷ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations Change 1* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2011), 7-1.

time, space, and purpose.”⁸ Clayton Newell introduces operational art in his essay “On Operational Art,” as using air, land, and sea forces to execute a campaign involving a series of battles to achieve intermediate and final objectives.⁹ While there are other definitions of operational art that exist, the common theme for the U.S. Army’s vision of operational art is that, in Newell’s words, operational art integrates the tactical capabilities of the services to achieve strategic aims.¹⁰ This monograph will use the *Unified Land Operations*’ definition of operational art.

The 1986 version of Field Manual 100-5, *Operations* was the first edition of U.S. Army doctrine to include operational art.¹¹ This manual defined operational art as “the employment of military forces to attain strategic goals in a theater of war or theater of operations thought the design, organization, and conduct of campaigns and major operations.”¹² Operational art, and the accompanying operational level, had evolved over the previous century. The Soviet Union began employing their version of operational art in the 1920s, and the Germans had a rough equivalent prior to World War I. However, the United States had remained wedded to the two levels of war consisting of strategy and tactics.¹³

Drs. James Schneider and Bruce Menning have written extensively about the origins of operational art and its evolution in the United States Army. In “The Loose Marble-and the Origins of Operational Art,” Dr. Schneider introduces two types of warfare; classical strategy and

⁸ Department of the Army, *Unified Land Operations*, Draft 9.6, 9.

⁹ Clayton R. Newell, “On Operational Art,” in *On Operational Art*, ed. Clayton Newell and Michael Krause (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 1994), 9.

¹⁰ Newell, “On Operational Art,” 9.

¹¹ Bruce W. Menning, “Operational Art’s Origins,” in *Historical Perspectives of the Operational Art*, ed. Michael Krause and R. Cody Phillips (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2004), 15.

¹² Department of the Army, Field Manual 100-5, *Operations* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986), 10.

¹³ Menning, “Operational Art’s Origins,” 3.

operational art, and then provides a chronological analysis of how modern operational art's roots lie in the American Civil War. Dr. Schneider goes so far as to identify 4 April 1864 as the birthdate of American operational art.¹⁴ He begins this argument by defining the two types of warfare. Classical warfare, he writes, was the strategy of a single point in which armies met for a decisive battle of annihilation.¹⁵ In this style of warfare, which saw Napoleon as its ultimate practitioner, massive armies would maneuver in single masses in order to meet in battle. The battle occurred on battlefields that were only a few miles square with the winner of this single decisive battle often winning the entire campaign or war.¹⁶

In his essay, "Operational Art's Origins," Bruce W. Menning, also describes the history of operational art and the strategy of a single point. As with Schneider, he identifies Napoleon as the last true practitioner of classical strategy, as well as citing the beginnings of American operational art in the Civil War. Menning writes that operational art long predates the use of the term. He also argues that the dispersion of Napoleon's single point into an extended line began during the American civil war and appears again as the trenches of World War I.¹⁷ Dr. Menning also writes that the growth of armies as well as technological advances created a gap between what was traditionally understood to be tactics and strategy. For Napoleon, operations were those events that occurred within the theater during the period when the armies were concentrated and maneuvered against each other to seek that decisive battle. By the 20th Century, Dr. Menning

¹⁴ James J. Schneider, "The Loose Marble-and the Origins of Operational Art," in *Parameters* 19 (March 1989): 92. Dr. Schneider argues that the birth of operational art was 4 April 1864 when General Grant presents a campaign plan that unites all military operations east of the Mississippi into "an integrated chain of operations." Grant's plan synchronizes the efforts of the Armies of West Virginia, the Potomac and the James in an effort to attack General Lee's Army and seize Richmond.

¹⁵ Ibid., 86.

¹⁶ Ibid. See also G.S. Isserson's *The Evolution of Operational Art*, in which he describes the conduct of pre-operational warfare as having two stages. The first was the long march along extended lines and then a short battle in one location upon the completion of the march. Isserson refers to Clausewitz's *On War* in defining this type of warfare as the 'strategy of a single point.'

¹⁷ Menning, "Operational Art's Origins," 5.

writes that strategy included many more variables than in 1815, and this development created a gap between traditional strategy and tactics.¹⁸ Operations filled that gap, becoming a "complex of military actions and battles linked by time, place, and intent," and might last for several weeks.¹⁹

Vietnam provided the impetus for the U.S. Army to embrace operational art and the operational level of war in the 1980s, fully six decades after the Soviets. Several authors discuss this evolution, most notably Dr. Richard Swain. In his essay "Filling the Void: The Operational Art and the U.S. Army," Swain writes that one of the common frustrations that came out of the Vietnam War was the absence of any linkage between strategic goals and the tactical actions being taken on the ground.²⁰ This argument forms the basis of Colonel Harold Summers' book *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War* in which he focuses on understanding the Vietnam War in Clausewitzian terms and concepts. Summers writes that the U.S. did not "properly employ our armed forces so as to secure U.S. national objectives in Vietnam."²¹ Swain argues that the U.S. Army did not develop the concept of operational in the same manner as the continental powers. Rather it was trying to understand what had happened in Vietnam and the campaign to restore an army ravaged by it that led to the U.S. Army's discovery of operational art.²²

¹⁸ Menning, "Operational Art's Origins," 7.

¹⁹ Ibid., 6.

²⁰ Richard M. Swain, "Filling the Void: The Operational Art and the U.S. Army," in *Developments in the Theory of War*, ed. B.J.C. McKercher and Michael Hennessy (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 1996), 164.

²¹ Harold G. Summers, *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1982), 4. In his book, Colonel Summers contradicts many of the War College report's findings and emphasizes the requirement for the Army to maintain a focus on maneuver warfare, and that the defeat in Vietnam was due in no small part to a lack of clarity and understanding between the political and military objectives of the conflict. He concludes that the key aspect of the Army's failure in Vietnam was neither tactics nor organization, but that it had not properly developed its capacity for strategic thinking to a level expected of a professional army.

²² Swain, "Filling the Void: The Operational Art and the U.S. Army," 162.

Using today's doctrine, practitioners of operational art use the elements of operational art to determine their endstate and arrange their activities to create a plan or bridge to reach it. The elements of operational art currently in Army doctrine are end state and conditions, centers of gravity, direct or indirect approach, decisive points, lines of operation and lines of effort, operational reach, tempo, simultaneity and depth, phasing and transitions, culmination, and risk.²³ This monograph will use these elements to analyze General Bell's campaign in the Philippines.

The U.S. Army first published its capstone doctrine, then titled *Field Service Regulations*, in 1905. This was the first time that the Army had codified the organization of its units and the principles under which they operated.²⁴ This first edition of *Field Service Regulations* had twelve chapters that covering such topics as the importance of intelligence, reconnaissance, and security operations, transportation and logistics, and instructions for guerrilla warfare and operating a military government.²⁵ As this regulation did not appear until after the Philippine War, leaders, like J. Franklin Bell, relied on their own personal experience, as well as articles from the various military professional journals to shape their planning. The *Cavalry Journal*, the *Journal of the United States Artillery*, and the *Journal of the Military Service Institution of the United States*, all carried articles regarding operations in the Philippines.²⁶

One tool that Brigadier General Bell did have, and which had precedent, was General Order # 100 or the Lieber Code. The Lieber Code, written in 1863 as a directive for the Federal Army, defined how soldiers should conduct themselves during war. It provided guidance on how

²³ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations Change 1*, 7-5.

²⁴ Dennis J. Vetrock, *Lessons Learned: A History of U.S. Army Lesson Learning* (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army Military History Institute, 1988), 30.

²⁵ U.S. War Department, *Field Service Regulations of the United States Army* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905), 6.

²⁶ Vetrock, *Lessons Learned: A History of U.S. Army Lesson Learning*, 31. See also Carol Ann Reardon's dissertation *The Study of Military History and the Growth of Professionalism in the U.S. Army before World War I*, which discusses the role of these journals as well as the creation, in 1909, of *American Campaigns*, the Army's first military history textbook.

to operate martial law and military governance as well as defining partisans, guerrillas and war rebels and how an army should treat each. Also included in General Order #100, was a new tool for commanders. This order empowered them to punish civilians for supporting guerrillas.²⁷ The Lieber Code also prescribed for the ethical treatment of prisoners and non-combatants. The code was purposefully ambiguous, as it specifically prohibited wanton violence, but defined that as merely being violence not necessitated by military reasons. At its core, the Lieber Code was written with the belief that a short war executed violently is, in the end, more humane and less destructive to the nation as a whole.²⁸ General Order #100 was such an effective document for commanders that it was included as Chapter 10 in the post- Philippine War edition of *Field Service Regulations* published in 1905.²⁹ The actions of Brigadier General Bell illustrate both the timelessness and intuitiveness of operational art. They demonstrate that even without doctrine and education, military leaders from the post-classical strategy era understood the importance of ensuring that their tactical actions were in pursuit of strategic aims.

THE PHILIPPINE WAR OF 1899-1902

The Philippines have a solid relationship with the United States today. This relationship, which has included military alliances, trade, World War II, and the creation of a Filipino constitution based, in part, on that of the United States, began with the Philippine War of 1899-1902.³⁰ Also referred to as the Philippine-American War, the Philippine War of Independence, or

²⁷ Thomas A. Bruno, “The Violent End of Insurgency on Samar 1901-1902,” *Army History* (Spring 2011): 33. See also, Lieutenant Colonel Bruno’s Strategy Research Paper for the US Army War College, *Ending an Insurgency Violently: The Samar and Batangas Punitive Campaigns*.

²⁸ Mark Grimsley, *The Hard Hand of War: Union Military Policy Toward Southern Civilians, 1861-1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 151.

²⁹ U.S. War Department, *Field Service Regulations of the United States Army*, 195.

³⁰ Anthony James Joes, “Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954” in *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, ed. Daniel Marston and Carter Malkasian, (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2010), 39.

the Philippine Insurrection, the conflict began within the confines of the Spanish-American War in 1898. Portuguese explorer Ferdinand Magellan found the Philippines in 1521 and claimed it for Spain.³¹ An archipelago comprised of over 7,000 islands, the Philippines' three major island groups, Luzon, the Visayas and the Sulu, cover an area of 500,000 square miles.³² Over the next forty years, the Spanish established some unity and rule of law on the islands, and then founded Manila, as the capital in 1571. However, few Spaniards settled in the Philippines and Spain did little more than the bare minimum to support and assimilate the colony. The Filipinos were not an homogenous people to begin with, having several different ethnicities, languages, and religions, and that less than ten percent of the Philippines population of over ten million knew Spanish in 1898 demonstrates Spain's limited investment in the islands, even over 300 years.³³

Spain had done little more concerning economic development or self-governance in the Philippines, and the educational and socially elite Filipinos formed a group aimed at attaining independence in the late 1800s.³⁴ Known as the Katipunan, the movement began in the Tondo district of Manila and spread to the rest of the provinces. Emilio Aguinaldo became a member in 1895. A municipal captain in the Cavite Province, Aguinaldo began locally, with military victories over local civil guards and regular Spanish units. Aguinaldo used these victories to expand his influence in the organization. In 1897, the Katipunan elected him president.

The Katipunan initiated their rebellion against the Spanish in August 1896. However, they were unable to hold their early gains and by February 1897, the Spanish had recaptured

³¹ Joes, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954," 15.

³² Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 15. See also Ronald E. Dolan *The Philippines: A Country Study*, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1993), 68.

³³ Joes, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954," 40. Also, Robert D. Ramsey III, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2007), 2.

³⁴ The islands had a system of patronage, whereby peasants/lower classmen worked on the estates of the landed gentry, the patrons, who provided land, seed, crop insurance as well as some educational and religious fees to their workers. These landowners became wealthy and formed their own elite class.

almost every rebel held town.³⁵ The Spanish offered a peace settlement to the rebels, who agreed to surrender in exchange for pardons and a cash settlement. In accordance with the terms of the peace, Aguinaldo and members of his leadership settled in exile in Hong Kong.³⁶ The truce was uneasy, and the rebels continued fighting the Spanish, establishing an independent, republican government just as the United States Navy arrived in Manila Bay in May 1898.³⁷

The United States' involvement in the Philippines was a secondary effect of the Spanish-American War. Called the Splendid Little War by some and “not much of a war, but the only one we had,” by future president Theodore Roosevelt, the Spanish-American War began in Cuba and by the time it concluded, ten weeks later, had spread to the Pacific.³⁸ The United States and Spain had maintained a contentious relationship since the end of the American Civil War. Spain’s involvement in Cuba, seen as an affront to the Monroe Doctrine, was one of the key elements to this. Following the Civil War, Americans had supported reform measures and revolts by the Cubans in 1896, 1878, and 1895.³⁹ However, it was not until President McKinley took office that the United States officially intervened. While there are a number of theories as to why the United States declared war against Spain, after the February 1898 sinking of the U.S.S. Maine in Havana, Congress and public opinion forced President McKinley to take action.⁴⁰

³⁵ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 16. Linn also writes that only 2000 of the 18,000 Spanish troops in the Philippines were actually Spaniards.

³⁶ Agoncillo, *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic*, 42. Professor Anthony James Joes also writes in "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954" in *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, that the Spanish paid a fee to the government of Hong Kong to accept Aguinaldo and his followers.

³⁷ Daniel B. Schirmer and Stephen R. Shalom, eds., *The Philippines Reader: a History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship, and Resistance* (Boston: South End Press, 1999), 6. See also, Teodoro A. Agoncillo, *Malolos: The Crisis of the Republic*, 115.

³⁸ Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*, ix.

³⁹ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁰ David J. Silbey, *A War of Frontier and Empire: the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007), 33.

Congress declared war on April 25, 1898, and on April 30, having been pre-positioned in Hong Kong since February, Commodore George Dewey sailed the Asiatic fleet through the straits that sheltered it and into Manila's harbor.⁴¹ Commodore Dewey made short work of the antiquated Spanish fleet, destroying it methodically on the morning of 1 May. By the end of the day, the United States Navy had destroyed the entire Spanish fleet in the Philippines as well as killing over four hundred sailors. The Americans had lost no ships or men during the battle.⁴²

Though the Spanish fleet sat on the harbor floor, the Spanish were not yet defeated in the Philippines. The United States did not secure Manila until August. On August 13, 1898, Army forces under the command of General Wesley Merritt seized the city after a mock battle with the Spanish garrison there. The Spanish, having made a clandestine arrangement with the Americans earlier, offered up token resistance just long enough to maintain their honor. According to the agreement between the Spanish and the United States, General Merritt agreed neither to bombard the city nor to allow the Filipino forces to enter Manila.⁴³ This illustrated to Aguinaldo, for perhaps the first time, that the United States did not see their relationship with the Filipinos as that of two nations allied in a war against Spain.⁴⁴ In the ensuing days, General Merritt and Commodore Dewey requested guidance from Washington. Writing that Aguinaldo's forces were pressuring the Americans for joint occupation, the officers asked for clarification as to their

⁴¹ Ronald E. Dolan *The Philippines: A Country Study*, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1993), 22. See also, H. Wayne Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*, and David J. Silbey, *A War of Frontier and Empire: the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*.

⁴² Silbey, *A War of Frontier and Empire: the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*, 39. See also, Anthony James Joes, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954" in *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, 41.

⁴³ Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*, 24.

⁴⁴ Dolan, *The Philippines: A Country Study*, 22. Also, H. Wayne Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*, 76.

mission and rules of engagement. The War Department's reply was clear; the United States held complete authority over the Philippines and would not consent to any joint occupation.⁴⁵

As August 1898, came to a close, the United States and Spain were preparing to negotiate the terms of their peace in Paris while in the Philippines the United States and the Filipinos eyed each other warily. The Filipinos felt betrayed, while the Americans were not yet sure what their position in the Philippines was. This led 15,000 Americans and approximately 13,000 Filipinos to dig fortifications facing each other outside of Manila.⁴⁶

The United States got involved in the Philippines as a way of opening another front or applying more pressure to the Spanish outside of Cuba. President McKinley did not foresee Commodore Dewey's swift victory in Manila Bay and did not expect the war to end as quickly as it did. Because of this, the United States did not have an official policy towards the Philippines.⁴⁷ The American military leaders in the Philippines asked for a clarification of their mission. The guidance that the White House sent Major General Merritt, commander of the Army's Philippine expedition illustrates how the American mission was both clear yet vague enough to allow significant room for interpretation. Historian David Trask summed up the President's instructions to General Merritt as simply, "Go to the Philippines, cooperate with the Navy, defeat the Spanish armed forces there, establish order and the sovereignty of the United States. . . [and] Open the ports to commerce."⁴⁸ This directive made no mention of an endstate, nor did it provide any indication as to the President's long-term plans for the islands.

In the aftermath of the battle of Manila, the United States continued to negotiate a peace settlement to end the Spanish-American War and to develop a long-term plan for the Philippines.

⁴⁵ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 26.

⁴⁶ Silbey, *A War of Frontier and Empire: the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*, 59.

⁴⁷ Joes, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954," 41.

⁴⁸ David F. Trask, *The War with Spain in 1898* (New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1981), 384.

At the same time, the U.S. continued to solidify its military position on the islands. Over the next four months, the United States debated what to do with the archipelago. There were many reasons for retaining the Philippines, and while most were economically or geopolitically inspired, such as increased trade and influence in the Asian markets and control of Subic Bay, there were also less concrete motives of commitment to helping the Filipinos and a strong feeling of destiny.⁴⁹

Finally, on 21 December 1898, President McKinley formally announced that the U.S. would employ a policy of benevolent assimilation in the Philippines, “substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule.”⁵⁰

As 1898 ended, having replaced General Merritt, Major General Elwell Otis commanded the United States forces in the Philippines, serving as Commander of VIII Corps, the Department of the Pacific, and the Philippines. Charged with winning the confidence, respect, and affection of the Filipinos, General Otis had to enforce the rule of law in the islands while also protecting the lives, property, and civil rights of the local populace. While General Otis had 40,000 troops under his command when hostilities broke out, a number that would grow to 70,000 within a year, only sixty percent of those soldiers were able to deploy to the field on any given day due to injury and illness.⁵¹ This meant that the force would be stretched thin to carry out both of these mission sets.

The Filipinos opposed the United States with traditional and guerrilla forces that may have been as large as 100,000 men with thousands more operating in an auxiliary role.⁵² Aguinaldo led the Filipinos, initially forming them as a regular force, against the Americans as they fought to establish an independent republic. In a touch of historical irony, Commodore

⁴⁹ Morgan, *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*, 97.

⁵⁰ Stuart Creighton Miller, *Benevolent Assimilation: The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982), ii. See also Ronald E. Dolan, *The Philippines: A Country Study*, 25.

⁵¹ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 324.

⁵² Ibid.

Dewey had previously encouraged Aguinaldo to organize a force prior to the arrival of American ground forces in the summer of 1898, and the United States had even provided arms and munitions to him.⁵³

After the fall of Manila, the Filipino independence movement and political organization continued to spread, and by the fall of 1898, the Filipinos had drafted a constitution based on those of France, Belgium, and several Latin American countries.⁵⁴ President McKinley's December 1898 declaration of benevolent assimilation made it clear that the United States planned to annex the Philippines. With this development, the balance of support shifted towards those members of the Filipino leadership who sought war. The Filipinos then elected Aguinaldo president in January of 1899, as many hoped that the growing anti-imperialist movement in the United States would aid them in securing a peaceful solution. However, this support did not materialize, and on January 4 1899, Aguinaldo, seeking independence for the Philippine Islands, declared war on the United States.⁵⁵

One month later, on February 4 1899, the war of conquest, or the war of insurrection depending on one's perspective, began. For the preceding months, the Army of Liberation maintained a loose perimeter around the American positions in Manila. On the fourth, 30,000 of them launched an attack on General Otis' forces.⁵⁶ Aguinaldo's plan was to synchronize the

⁵³US Congress, Senate Committee on the Philippines, "Testimony of Admiral Dewey," in *Affairs in the Philippine Islands: Hearings before the Committee on the Philippines of the United States Senate*, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), 2958.

⁵⁴ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 10.

⁵⁵ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 10. See also, Ronald E. Dolan *The Philippines: A Country Study*, 25.

⁵⁶ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 42. Like all good wars, the actual opening shots of this one are disputed. While tensions were high in Manila and some minor confrontations had occurred, the situation was stable enough so that Aguinaldo felt that he could attend a ball while giving many of his leaders leave. Brian M. Linn writes in *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, that an American sentry fired the first shots at a Filipino patrol that had refused to answer his challenge. Gunfire spread up and down the line, and within a few hours, the war had spontaneously begun.

attack on Manila with a popular uprising, but this did not occur. This failure sent the Army of Liberation on a path to failure. Within five days, American units were consolidating and reorganizing and on 10 February, Major General Arthur MacArthur, then commanding the 2nd Division, went on the offensive with Dewey providing naval gunfire in support.⁵⁷

After seizing trains and rail lines outside of Manila in this attack, General MacArthur's division continued to fight. By February 23, the Americans had defeated the Army of Liberation in Manila, and the United States continued to pursue the Army of Liberation through the month of March. While the Americans were routinely beating the Army of Liberation on the battlefield, the Filipinos were able to consistently disengage with their pursuers and avoid complete destruction of capture, often burning towns in the wake as they withdrew.⁵⁸ By 31 March, the Americans had captured Malabon, the capital of the Philippine Republic, and continued to advance through central Luzon and the Tagalog provinces during April, May and June 1899.⁵⁹ The United States Army thoroughly outclassed Aguinaldo's Army of Liberation in conventional battle. While the Americans were not always able to capitalize on their victories, they continued to win battles and seize terrain. Losses in battle as well as conflicts between various Filipino factions sapped the Army of Liberation; by the summer of 1899, it counted only 4,000 members on its active rolls.⁶⁰

By November of that year, the Americans had begun a large offensive in the north, seizing Tarlac, then the capital of the Philippine Republic on 13 November. Aguinaldo, recognizing that the Army of Liberation could not win a war for independence with

⁵⁷ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 42, 53, 57. See also Robert D. Ramsey III, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 14.

⁵⁸ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 16.

⁵⁹ Brian M. Linn, *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 12.

⁶⁰ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 20.

conventional tactics, dissolved his army.⁶¹ Aguinaldo convened a war council on 12 November 1899. During this meeting, the Filipinos changed their strategy to one of guerrilla warfare.⁶²

The transition to guerrilla warfare gave the Americans a false sense of accomplishment. Many believed that the defeat of the Army of Liberation meant the same thing as the defeat of the Filipinos. General MacArthur demonstrated this himself less than two weeks later, saying on 23 November 1899, "The so-called Filipino republic is destroyed. The congress is dissolved. The president of that body is now a prisoner in our hands. The president of the so-called republic is a fugitive, as are all the cabinet officers, excepting one in our hands. . . . The army itself as an organization has disappeared."⁶³

General Otis based his assessment on these tactical actions as well, declaring in mid-December that there was no longer an organized rebellion and that his troops were merely pursuing bands of criminals. While there were over 442 skirmishes between the Americans and the Filipinos between January and April of 1899, General Otis maintained the belief that he had quelled the insurrection. He requested his relief that spring, stating "we no longer deal with organized insurrection, but brigandage; to render every town secure against latter would require

⁶¹ Linn, *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 16. See also Anthony James Joes, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954" in *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, 43. Aguinaldo divided Luzon into three districts, maintaining personal authority over the north, and placing Mariano Trias in charge of southern Luzon and Pantaleo Garcia in charge of central Luzon. Dr. Linn writes that while Aguinaldo may have envisioned exercising personal control over the strategies in the three zones this never happened as he was often on the run, though he remained a potent symbol for the Filipinos throughout the war.

⁶² Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*, 23.

⁶³ Ibid., 21. See also Brian M. Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, page 63. Linn writes that General MacArthur had said that Aguinaldo told him that at the beginning of the fighting his soldiers were sure, but "the American lines continued to advance and no men fell. Our men became alarmed at the fact that the American troops seemed to be invincible." Linn argues, "MacArthur himself concluded that the Filipino soldiers 'never entirely recovered' from this experience."

quarter million men; the war has increased brigandage in Luzon, though it has always prevailed in mountain sections, and in some of the islands much more than it does today.”⁶⁴

However, the Americans had miscalculated; the war was not yet over. The Filipinos had experience in waging guerrilla war. Just as the Americans looked to their past for directives on how to conduct operations, so too did Aguinaldo. He lifted his operational plan from the Filipinos experience in the earlier uprising against the Spanish. Using the guerrilla instructions from 1887, Aguinaldo stipulated that the object of the guerrillas was to fight the Americans constantly in the towns they occupied, and to attack their convoys. The purpose behind these operations was simply to inflict as much damage as possible. Aguinaldo hoped that when combined with disease and the inhospitable terrain the guerrilla attacks would demoralize the Americans and this would lead to demoralization in America and a victory in the upcoming election for the William Jennings Bryan the anti-imperialist candidate for president who had endorsed independence for the Philippine Islands.⁶⁵

The area of responsibility that General J. Franklin Bell was to assume, Batangas, was at the center of the next phases of this war. For the bulk of 1899, with the Americans occupied elsewhere, the commander of Filipino forces in Batangas, Miguel Malvar, had been left to his own devices. Malvar had his men prepare elaborate defenses across the province in reparation for an invasion.⁶⁶ In January of 1900, General Otis directed two brigades to eliminate Filipino resistance in Cavite, Batangas, Laguna, and Tayabas. He believed that this would be done by

⁶⁴ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902.*, 23.

⁶⁵ Ramsey, *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902.*, 23.

⁶⁶ Glenn Anthony May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 76. Dr. May also writes that there was fighting during 1899, but that it was never sustained and was predictable. There would be Filipino activity, followed by a brief expeditionary response from the Americans. During these forays, the US Army would move into the province, possibly establishing a small new garrison, and then return to Manila, never staying more than a few days. The Filipinos would harass the outposts and the troops but rarely in force and they never overran any of them.

"thrashing them soundly on the battlefield."⁶⁷ The results of this were the Filipinos losing what set piece or conventional action they fought, yet the guerrillas of Batangas held out.

General Frederick Funston captured Aguinaldo on 23 March 1901, and in the months that followed his capture the fighting continued Batangas.⁶⁸ Though defeated on the conventional battlefield, Malvar's forces continued to resist and a large portion of the population continued to support him.⁶⁹ On 28 September, Filipino guerrillas attacked the American garrison at Balangiga, on the island of Samar. Only four of the 74 men assigned there escaped injury. Then governor William H. Taft and Major General Adna Chafee, commander of the Division of the Philippines responded to this massacre with a campaign designed to end all insurrectos resistance on Sama and Luzon. General Chafee chose to put two of his most experienced generals, Bell and Brigadier General Jacob Smith in charge.⁷⁰ When General Bell arrived, Batangas had come to symbolize the Filipino resistance to the Americans.

BELL'S CAMPAIGN

General Bell graduated from West Point in 1878 and was a member of the Illinois Bar. After serving as a cavalryman in the western United States for almost twenty years, he was among the first officers to arrive in the Philippines, serving on General Merritt's VIII Corps

⁶⁷ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 94.

⁶⁸ Joes, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954," 47.

⁶⁹ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 241.

⁷⁰ Robert Ramsey III, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, 2007), 5. While Major general Arthur MacArthur had been Governor-General in the Philippines, this position was separated after his departure with future President Taft assuming the role of Governor of the Philippines and General Chaffee assuming command of the Division of the Philippines on 4 July 1901. The split of these roles resulted in part from the Taft Commission who had deemed the Philippines ready for civil governance, not military law. In a memorandum to the

staff.⁷¹ On 30 November 1901, after having been Philippines for three years he assumed command of 3rd Separate Brigade of the Department of the North Philippines.⁷² After his arrival with VIII Corps in 1898, General Bell had subsequently served with General MacArthur, been awarded the Medal of Honor, and seen duty as the Provost Marshall in Manila. Understanding that every area in the Philippines was different and that what worked in one area of operations might not work in any other, General Bell began his command by gathering information in order to understand his specific problem in Batangas. He used the first two weeks after assuming command to assess the situation, as a part of this interviewed every prominent Filipino with knowledge of the area that he could find.⁷³

The orders General Bell received were clear, providing him with a definitive objective, ending the rebellion in Batangas and making peace. They were also vague enough to enable him to design his plan to do so.⁷⁴ General Bell described the overall purpose of the mission in his address to his officers on 1 December 1901 at the Port of Batangas, stating, “We have only one purpose, and that is to force the insurgents and those in sympathy with them to want peace.”⁷⁵ General Bell was also charged with doing this quickly, telling his commanders “I have been sent

⁷¹ Edgar F. Raines, Jr., “Major General J. Franklin Bell and Military Reform: The Chief of Staff Years, 1906-1910” (doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1976), 6.

⁷² U.S. Department of War, *Correspondence Relating to the War with Spain: Including the Insurrection in the Philippine Islands and the China Relief Expedition, April 15, 1898, to July 30, 1902*, Volume 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), 1302. On 9 November 1901, General Order # 148 reorganized the Division of the Philippines into two Departments. These were the Department of the North, commanded by MG Loyd Wheaton, and the Department of the South, commanded by BG James F. Wade. The Department of the North includes all portions of the islands north of the Mindoro strait and including the entire island of Masbate.

⁷³ BG J. Franklin Bell, “Annual Report of Operations in the 3rd Separate Brigade,” in *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), p 177. See also Glenn Anthony May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 248. And also Robert Ramsey III, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 7.

⁷⁴ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 248.

⁷⁵ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 39.

here with instructions to put an end to insurrection and re-establish peace in the shortest time practicable.⁷⁶ Understanding that expedience was an essential element in accomplishing his mission, General Bell also believed that that his mission would bring destruction and suffering to the province and that he might suffer personal vilification because of it.⁷⁷ Given that, and his investigations, he saw that the most expedient path to carrying out his mission would be through population and resource control. In his annual report to the War Department, General Bell wrote his assessment showed him that, “the only way I could possibly succeed in putting an end to insurrection within the territorial limits of the brigade would be by cutting off the income and food of the insurgents, and by crowing them persistently with operations as to wear them out.”⁷⁸

In addition to fighting the insurgents, securing his area of operations, and providing for his men and equipment, General Bell wrote that his duties as the 3rd Separate Brigade Commander included a myriad of tasks not commonly associated with command of an Army brigade. These included, the “apprehension, collection of evidence, trial, disposition and imprisonment of criminals; the reestablishment of civil government, of schools, mail, and telegraphic communications; the reconstruction of roads and bridges; the collection of revenue taxes...supervising the affairs of provincial and municipal governments...and the discharge of all other duties heretofore performed by civil officials.”⁷⁹ While he may not have had Army doctrine, General Bell did have guidance, in the form of General Order #100, under which to operate.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 32.

⁷⁷ Ramsey, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 6.

⁷⁸ Bell, “Annual Report of Operations in the 3rd Separate Brigade,” in *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902*, 177.

⁷⁹ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 199.

⁸⁰ Swain, "Filling the Void: The Operational Art and the U.S. Army," 151. For further reading on the U.S. Army doctrine of this period, see Andrew J. Birtle, *US Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2004).

Having succeeded General Otis as the commander VII Corps and as Governor-General in the Philippines in May of 1900, General MacArthur recognized both the relationship between the guerrillas and the towns, and the significance of Aguinaldo's declaration of guerrilla war and sought to seize the initiative quickly from the Filipinos. To do this he first issued an order to arm local police forces and create an indigenous constabulary cavalry. In October of 1900, as the guerrillas applied pressure to the Americans with successful attacks during the election season, General MacArthur ordered General Order #100 be enacted and ordered that all Filipino military aged males be treated as hostile. He also decreed that, in accordance with General Order #100, all guerrillas and those supporting them were in violation of the law as would be treated as criminals as well.⁸¹ With these actions, General MacArthur fundamentally changed the course of the war, shifting his focus to punitive measures against those resisting the Americans' authority.

Previously, the United States had primarily focused on civic action and reconstruction to win the support of the population. The Americans had attempted to attract the Filipino population's support through a series of health, education, infrastructure, and transportation reforms on the islands.⁸² The civic action initiatives that formed the foundation of his predecessor's campaign would continue, but they would be a supporting operation. While this was a drastic realignment, and the methods were harsh, they were also very effective. A year later, General MacArthur's successor, General Adna Chaffee now the commander of the Division of the Philippines, stated that only three provinces were still actively hostile.⁸³

After taking command and conducting his commander's assessment to understand the situation, General Bell developed a concept of operations for his campaign and disseminated it to

⁸¹ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 209. See also Anthony James Joes, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines 1898-1954," in *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, 43.

⁸² Bruno, "The Violent End of Insurgency on Samar, 1901-1902," 32.

⁸³ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 214.

his officers. He did this first in person, meeting with all of his officers at the port of Batangas in the beginning of December, and then via telegraph. General Bell commanded and controlled his brigade using telegraphic circulars that he sent to all of his subordinate unit commanders. General Bell's plan in Batangas was to force the Filipinos to seek peace by conducting operations that would "make the existing state of war and martial law so inconvenient and unprofitable to the disloyal people that they will earnestly desire and work for the re-establishment of peace and civil government."⁸⁴

The first phase of General Bell's plan was to spend the month of December instituting population and resource control measures to concentrate the population and physically isolate them from the insurgents. To do this, he planned to establish secured sites within the province, inside of which all law-abiding residents would live. Soldiers garrisoned in these towns would both protect the population and keep an eye on them. General Bell's forces would also gather all foodstuffs and livestock from the province and transport them to the secured towns so that they would not fall into the guerrillas' hands as well.⁸⁵ He also planned to conduct raids to interdict insurgent groups and seize their caches of food. In January 1902, General Bell planned to transition to the second phase of his plan in which he would continue to restrict the population's movement and hunt down the guerrillas throughout his area of operations. He believed that two months of this action would crush the insurgency in Batangas.⁸⁶

While General Bell did not have doctrine that included the elements of operational art such as exists today, he understood them and used many of them as he sought to understand,

⁸⁴ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #19, 24 December 1901 in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 64.

⁸⁵ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #3, 9 December 1901 in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 46.

⁸⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 8.

visualize, describe, direct, and assess the activities of his subordinate units. According to Army doctrine, the elements of operational art help the commander to identify tasks and objectives that he must accomplish in order to achieve his desired endstate.⁸⁷ The first element of operational art that General Bell addressed was endstate and conditions. Defined as the “desired future condition represented by the expressed conditions that the commander wants to exist when an operation ends,” endstate and conditions include a vision of what the friendly forces, the enemy forces, and any other neutral or civilian actors will look like upon completion of the operation.⁸⁸ It can also include desired geographical and political conditions.

In what one might consider a commander’s back brief, General Bell described the conditions that he expected to achieve in a letter to his commander, Major General Loyd Wheaton, the Commander of the Department of the North Philippines. He wrote that at the conclusion of two months he thought that there would be no insurrection in his area of operations. General Bell specifically addressed the status of his enemy. Identifying them first as locally raised forces, General Bell explained that the guerrillas supplied each town with a certain number of weapons and required them to provide a certain number of soldiers to use them in support of Malvar. He told General Wheaton that he planned to defeat these guerrillas writing that while at the end of two months, “we may not have secured all the guns or caught all the insurgents,” and that while he may have not captured Malvar by that time, that his guerrilla force will be diminished thorough battle and desertion.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations* Change 1, 7-5. According to this manual, the elements of operational art are End State and Conditions, Centers of Gravity, Approach, Decisive Points, Lines of Operation/Effort, Operational Reach, Tempo, Simultaneity and Depth, Phasing and transitions, Culmination, and Risk.

⁸⁸ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations* Change 1, 7-6.

⁸⁹ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 8.

General Bell also addressed the terrain in this letter, stating that his men had already cleared and secured one village. He then described the general route that his forces will take over the ensuing two months. General Bell wrote that after beginning in the Lobo peninsula, he would move to Lake Taal and then to the Lipa Mountains before completing his maneuvers at the home of Malvar's parents in Mount Maquiling. At this point, he writes that he expected to "have every town in these provinces in the same attitude."⁹⁰

In this same letter, General Bell described the disposition of his forces. While he did not describe where he saw his forces at the conclusion of the operations, save for securing towns, he did address their organization and employment. General Bell wrote that he planned to organize 2,500 of his men into units, or columns of 50 men. On 1 January 1902, these columns would then deploy in order to search the countryside for supplies and guerrillas and destroy or kill all that they find outside of the secured towns.⁹¹ General Bell also described some of the civil conditions that he expected to impose during this operation informing General Wheaton that he planned to pressure town officials and police into cooperating with the Americans.⁹² He expanded on this in his telegraphic circular of 23 December 1901, instructing his subordinate commanders to arrest all town officials, police officers, and other prominent Filipinos who are not actively supporting the American forces.⁹³

These conditions formed the endstate that General Bell described in his letter to General Wheaton. In two months, he expected that the countryside to be cleared of guerrillas, the bulk of

⁹⁰ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 9.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #18, 23 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 63. See also Glenn Anthony May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 251.

the population secured in garrisoned towns with local governance and security provided by either the Americans or Filipinos who have sworn an oath to support them, and Malvar's guerrillas will no longer be able to undertake any significant activities. General Bell's campaign plan is designed to "to force the insurgents and those in sympathy with them to want peace," which will create the conditions that form his desired endstate.⁹⁴

Another element of operational art that General Bell addressed was phasing. In his concept for operations in Batangas, General Bell clearly described two distinct phases. Phasing is important in complex operations, and each phase of an operation should focus the forces effort for that period, concentrate combat power at a decisive point, and accomplish its objectives. Army doctrine defines a phase as "a planning and execution tool used to divide an operation in duration or activity."⁹⁵ General Bell's first phase would occur during the month of December when he planned to secure the population and attack the guerrilla infrastructure. The second phase began once the population was relocated and secured, in January and would consist of a significant uptick in combat operations to hunt the guerrillas and place pressure on them.⁹⁶

General Bell's first phase was the securing of the population and initial attacks on the guerrillas' infrastructure.⁹⁷ General Bell planned to for this to happen during the last three weeks of December.⁹⁸ Doctrinally, achieving an objective or establishing a set of conditions marks the end of a pause. General Bell described the conditions and an objective for the end of his first phase in his letter to General Wheaton on 26 December,

⁹⁴ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 39.

⁹⁵ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations Change 1*, 7-14.

⁹⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 7.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Mark Moyar, *A Question of Command: Counterinsurgency from the Civil War to Iraq* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 85.

the people are now assembled in towns, with all the visible food supply, except that cached by insurgents in the mountains. For the next six days all station commanders will be employed hunting insurgents and their hidden food supplies within their respective jurisdictions. Population of each town will be turned out, and all transportation that can be found impressed to bring into government storehouses all food that is found, if it be possible to transport it. If not, it will be destroyed.⁹⁹

In Telegraphic Circular #18, on 23 December 1901, Bell instructed his commanders to begin the second phase of the operation on 1 January 1902, or as soon thereafter. General Bell planned to begin this second phase in the garrisoned towns where he directed the arrest of all municipal leaders and prominent Filipinos, as well as all policemen who have not fully complied with directives to actively aid the Americans.¹⁰⁰ Outside of the towns, General Bell restricted movement, effectively creating free fire zones, and sought to flood the area with troops in order to conduct nearly continuous counterguerrilla operations.¹⁰¹

Carl von Clausewitz introduces the concept of a center of gravity in *On War* as "the hub of all power and movement, on which everything depends."¹⁰² The modern definition used by the U.S. military has refined this to describe the center of gravity as the source of power that provides moral or physical strength, freedom of action, or will to act.¹⁰³ In both definitions, a combatant defeats an enemy by taking his center of gravity away from him. He does this by destroying it, rendering it incapable of use, or denying the enemy access to it. While he may or may not have been familiar with *On War*, General Bell understood the concept of a center of gravity. He

⁹⁹ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 8.

¹⁰⁰ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #18, 23 December 1901, and Telegraphic Circular #12, 21 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 58. 63.

¹⁰¹ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 9.

¹⁰² Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, (New York, NY: Princeton University Press, 1989), 595.

¹⁰³ Department of Defense, Joint Publication 3-0, *Joint Operations Change 1* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008), IV-10.

identified Malvar's guerrilla forces in the province as the Filipino resistance's center of gravity, and constructed a campaign that centered on applying pressure, directly and indirectly, upon the guerrillas throughout its course.¹⁰⁴

In his introductory address, General Bell told his subordinate commanders that they would have to actively seek out and fight the guerrillas as "without first whipping them and convincing them that we are able to accomplish our purposes by force if necessary...we can never command their respect."¹⁰⁵ In order to maintain pressure on the guerrillas, General Bell wrote that after 1 January 1902, he would "keep the country full of scouting detachments and can give the insurgents no peace."¹⁰⁶ In the months that followed, he did so, maintaining a counterguerrilla force of 4000 men deployed into the field at all times.¹⁰⁷ General Bell told General Wheaton that he would use his troops to kill or capture all possible guerrillas, whom he identified as all able-bodied men that were outside the secure towns and villages.¹⁰⁸

General Bell also knew that he would have to apply indirect pressure on the guerrillas as well. He believed that in regular, conventional wars that pit one army and nation-state against another, the population is not a direct provider of material support and not usually a significant player as the nation supports the force. However, in guerrilla warfare, that state support apparatus does not exist, and the enemy relies on the assistance of the population-voluntary or coerced for

¹⁰⁴ John M. Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags*, (London: Greenwood Press, 1973), 261.

¹⁰⁵ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, by Robert Ramsey III, 37.

¹⁰⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 9.

¹⁰⁷ Gates, *Schoolbooks and Krags*, 260.

¹⁰⁸ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 8. Also Andrew J Birtle, *US Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941*, 134.

security, supply, intelligence, and communications. To end this type of war General Bell wrote, one must detect and punish these supporters.¹⁰⁹

He explained this to his subordinate leaders in his first meeting with them in early December 1901, telling them that they will be unable to convince the population of the American cause easily. With his previous three years' experience, General Bell knew that they would not be able to do this through kindness and civic action alone. The key to garnering the support of the population would be through their leaders. He told his officers that "to succeed in our purpose, we must make it to the interest of his leaders to order and counsel him to so that which we want him to do....it will in all probability be generally necessary to adopt drastic measures."¹¹⁰

Key to General Bell's concept to defeat the guerrillas in Batangas was using population and resource control measures to separate the population from the guerrillas. Once he had isolated the population, he planned to hunt down and destroy the guerrilla groups. General Bell gave his commanders wide latitude and urged them to pursue the enemy and keep on the offensive.¹¹¹ In late December, General Bell directed his commanders to deploy patrols daily with orders to hunt down guerrillas in their local areas of operations, and followed this order up the next day with a reminder that commanders must be bold and aggressive in their operations.¹¹² General Bell meant to attack his enemy's center of gravity directly.

Current Army doctrine defines this as employing a direct approach. In every operation, a commander chooses an approach. This is how the force is going to attack the enemy's center of

¹⁰⁹ BG J. Franklin Bell memoranda in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 114.

¹¹⁰ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 35.

¹¹¹ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 253.

¹¹² BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #10, 20 December 1901, and Telegraphic Circular #12, 21 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 58.

gravity. There are two types of approaches, direct and indirect. When employing a direct approach, the commander applies combat power directly onto his enemy's center of gravity. Current Army doctrine defines an indirect approach as still attacking the enemy's center of gravity, but in this case doing so by applying that combat power to a series of decisive points that will influence the center of gravity while avoiding direct engagement with it.¹¹³

General Bell's campaign plan directly attacked the guerrillas. General Bell called for an increase in counterguerrilla operations beginning in 1902 that would occur simultaneously with securing the population. General Bell told his officers in order to gain the respect of the Filipinos they must demonstrate their strength and intention to punish the guerrillas and those who aid them to them. The best way to do this was to attack the guerrilla groups and "whipping them."¹¹⁴ Only after defeating them on the field of battle could the American hope to gain the respect and trust of the populace.

General Bell also sought to engage the guerrillas indirectly. Believing that the local populace was directly supporting Malvar and the guerrillas, General Bell began his indirect approach on December 9, 1901, when he ordered the first set of arrests. In this directive, he ordered commanders to arrest all municipal presidents and chief of police that they had any evidence linking them to guerrilla support.¹¹⁵ General Bell followed this up with another order on

¹¹³ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations* Change 1, 7-6. This manual also describes defeat and stability mechanisms associated with the approach. In J Franklin Bell's case, the defeat mechanism that he seeks to employ is isolate. The doctrinal definition of isolate as a defeat mechanism is to deny an enemy or adversary access to capabilities that enable the exercise of coercion, influence, potential advantage, and freedom of action. Isolation limits the enemy's ability to conduct operations effectively by marginalizing one or more of these capabilities. There are two types of isolation, physical and psychological and Bell planned to use both and then employ other operations and defeat mechanisms in order to defeat Malvar's guerrillas.

¹¹⁴ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 37.

¹¹⁵ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #3, 9 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 49.

18 December to take all priests into custody, releasing them only once local commanders were sure that they had turned against the guerrillas and would “use their influence to work for peace.”¹¹⁶ Telegraphic Circular #18 directed a third deliberate series of arrests for 1 January 1902. In this directive, sent on 23 December 1901, General Bell instructed all commanders that on New Year’s Day the second phase of the operation will begin. While the previous arrests were limited to leaders of whom the Americans had evidence of collusion, in this phase General Bell directed the arrest of all municipal leaders and prominent Filipinos as well as that of all policemen who had not fully complied with directives to actively aid the Americans.¹¹⁷

In addition to seeking to influence the population through the elites, General Bell proscribed other tactical actions to separate the insurgents from the population. Looking at the insurrection holistically, General Bell attacked it in several places with his own system of control and actions. To prevent the guerrillas from receiving external support, primarily in the way of supplies and food from outside the region, he ordered the ports in Batangas and Laguna closed. General Bell also restricted the transportation of supplies, primarily food, between different towns in his area of operations. Additionally, he restricted travel by all non-combatants, requiring that anyone traveling outside a secured zone have a pass for the American commander.¹¹⁸

Establishing control of the population was one of the two primary decisive points that General Bell had identified in his plan. Decisive Points are not the enemy’s center of gravity but rather intermediate objectives or keys that used to attack the center of gravity. By definition, a decisive point is “a geographic place, specific key event, critical factor, or function that, when acted upon, allows commanders to gain a marked advantage over an adversary or contribute

¹¹⁶ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 251.

¹¹⁷ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #18, 23 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 63.

¹¹⁸ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 250.

materially to achieving success.”¹¹⁹ General Bell identified two decisive points for the 3rd Separate Brigade in Batangas. These were the establishing control of the population, and securing the firearms in the province.

The most important of these was securing the arms. General Bell described this as the decisive point in this campaign, writing, in Telegraphic Circular # 21 that “the primary and most important object of all of our operations in this Brigade is to obtain possession of the arms now in the hands of insurgents and disloyal persons.” He stated that this is more important than capturing guerrillas and that in fact it is undesirable to accept a guerrilla’s surrender unless he is surrendering his guns as well.¹²⁰ General Bell reinforced the importance of the obtaining the insurgents’ guns in a later directive in which he reminded his commanders of the importance of securing the guns and provided further guidance on what the types of weapons to confiscate. General Bell informed his commanders that though a weapon appears unserviceable they should still take it because a guerrilla could still use it to intimidate the local populace, and that the Filipino standards of serviceability were different from theirs.¹²¹

The second decisive point in General Bell’s campaign was the first reached chronologically. This was the relocation of the population and the introduction of population and resource controls. Intending to isolate the guerrillas from their support structure, General Bell planned to do this by this establishing control of the population. Done by concentrating the population into secured sites or towns with a garrison force, this action was key in that it enabled the 3rd Separate Brigade to create a physical barrier between the non-combatant local populace and the guerrillas. In addition to relocating the populace, General Bell also prohibited movement

¹¹⁹ Department of Defense, Joint Publication 3-0, *Joint Operations* Change 1, IV-12.

¹²⁰ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #21, 24 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 68.

¹²¹ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #34, 12 February 1902 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 81.

outside of the town, requiring anyone outside of the secured zones to have a pass signed by the local commander.¹²² By doing this the army not only prevented the guerrillas from receiving the bulk of their support from the villagers, but it meant that anyone who was outside of a secured zone was most likely an enemy combatant which enabled them to treat the majority of the Brigade's area of operations as a free fire zone.¹²³

In order to hunt down the guerrillas, General Bell informed General Wheaton that he would first create 50 man units from about 2,500 of his infantry and cavalrymen. Their tasks were to destroy all supplies found outside of the town and kill or capture all able-bodied men.¹²⁴ General Bell also defined the general line that their operations would follow. As an element of operational art, doctrine defines a line of operation as “a line that defines the directional orientation of a force in time and space in relation to the enemy and links the force with its base of operations and objectives.”¹²⁵ In his description to General Wheaton, General Bell laid out a line of operation that resembles a series of spokes emanating from a hub. He wrote that he would begin his attacks on Malvar’s guerillas by first attacking south of his headquarters in Batangas, and return past it as he cleared each direction sequentially:

I expect to first clean out the wide Loboo Peninsula south of Batangas, Tiasan, and San Juan de Boc road. I shall then move command to the vicinity of Lake Taal and sweep the country westward to the ocean and south of Cavite; returning through Lipa, I shall scour and clean up the Lipa mountains; swinging

¹²² BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #14, 21 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 60.

¹²³ In Telegraphic Circular #3, 9 December 1901, BG Bell discussed the role that the clergy played in the insurrection. Of particular interest to General Bell was isolating the guerrillas from the Philippine clergy. He believed that the clergy have long supported the guerrillas and been ignored by the Army due to their status as religious leaders. General Bell was clear in his assessment of the clergy, informing his men “it may be considered as practically certain that every native priest in the provinces of Batangas and Laguna is a secret enemy of the government and in active sympathy with the insurgents. These are absolutely our most dangerous enemies.”

¹²⁴ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 8.

¹²⁵ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations Change 1*, 7-10.

northward, the country in the vicinity of San Pablo, Alaminos, Tanauan, and Santo Tomas will be scoured, ending at Mount Maquiling, which will then be thoroughly searched and devastated. This is said to be the home of Malvar and his parents.¹²⁶

In addition to a physical line of operation, General Bell also had lines of effort. Known in Joint Doctrine as Logical Lines of Operation, units use lines of effort to link military and nonmilitary tasks and actions with the desired endstate. The Army defines lines of effort as a line, usually not a physical line on the ground, that “links multiple tasks and missions using the logic of purpose—cause and effect—to focus efforts toward establishing operational and strategic conditions.”¹²⁷ General Bell’s orders describe four distinct lines of effort in Batangas. These are counterguerrilla operations, population security, civil governance, and economics.

General Bell’s main effort was counterguerrilla operations. From the beginning of his campaign until the end, he consistently exhorted his men to stay on the offensive, seize the initiative, and maintain pressure on the guerrillas. On 23 January 1902, having recently returned from circulating amongst all of his commanders, General Bell issued Telegraphic Circular # 30 in which he reminded his commanders that they must keep attacking the guerillas in the field. He instructed them to ensure they deploy detachments constantly to fight the guerillas.¹²⁸

The 3rd Separate Brigade’s second line of effort was securing the population. For General Bell this included both isolating them physically from the guerrillas, and providing for their needs, “We owe the pacific people protection and must adopt some way of demonstrating our ability to give it.”¹²⁹ General Bell stressed the importance of providing security in his second

¹²⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 9.

¹²⁷ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations Change 1*, 7-10.

¹²⁸ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #30, 23 January 1902 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 75.

¹²⁹ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 37.

telegraphic circular, issued 8 December 1901, in which he wrote, “All ungarrisoned towns will be garrisoned as soon as troops become available.”¹³⁰ Cognizant of the importance of securing the population in their new locations, as well as to provide more men for counterguerrilla operations, General Bell instructed his commanders that police who have actively assisted and fought with the Americans may keep their weapons and continue to work alongside them.¹³¹

Just as importantly, General Bell was aware of the hardships that many of the resettled areas suffered. During December 1901, he had instructed that towns accumulate as much rice as possible, storing it within the towns where it could be better protected and used by the Filipinos.¹³² After seeing the poor state of many of the towns while visiting his commanders, in late January 1902, General Bell took measures to stop the destruction of food in the wilderness and attempt to transport it back to the towns that needed it.¹³³ While General Bell’s relocation policies may have contributed to an outbreak of malaria in Batangas, or at least to its spread, the 3rd Separate Brigade did take steps to contain it and care for those affected.¹³⁴ Throughout the second phase of General Bell’s campaign, his medical officers also vaccinated the local populace against smallpox. General Bell later wrote that his surgeons had inoculated over 300,000

¹³⁰ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #2, 8 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 45.

¹³¹ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #4, 11 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 51.

¹³² BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #10, 20 December 1901 in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 58.

¹³³ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 265.

¹³⁴ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 267. See also Major William Stephenson’s memorandum to all commanders in the 3rd Separate Brigade, 16 January 1902, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, by Robert Ramsey III, 86.

Filipinos and prevented the smallpox outbreak that traditionally occurred in the first quarter of each calendar year.¹³⁵

General Bell took other steps to provide security for the local populace. He issued several orders designed to ensure that Filipinos in the resettled areas were able to provide for their families. In his initial instructions to his offices, General Bell informed them that providing the Filipinos with a legitimate way to provide for their families will increase both economic and physical security in the secured zones. He stated that the Army should pay for all supplies and labor provided by the local populace.¹³⁶ During the first month of the campaign, General Bell described how to employ the population in one of his telegraphic circulars, authorizing his commanders to conscript all able-bodied men in their secured towns to work for 15 days. He instructed Commanders to use this labor for roadwork, most likely because improvements to the road infrastructure would help the Army's mobility at that time and would enhance commerce once the war was over. Commanders would pay the Filipinos for their work, another method to stimulate the economy, and a Filipino could pay a tax to avoid this duty. This conscription provided the local populace with a source of income and food, and aided the Army in that it kept the men busy.¹³⁷ Towards the end of the campaign, General Bell felt it necessary to remind his commanders of this again, instructing them in mid-February that whenever they employ Filipinos for labor they must pay them. This rule also applied when for using Filipino transportation assets to haul food and supplies.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Bell, "Annual Report of Operations in the 3rd Separate Brigade," 179.

¹³⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 40.

¹³⁷ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #19, 24 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 65.

¹³⁸ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #35, 15 February 1902, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 81.

The Provost Court System, interim governance, and return of the province to civilian control were decisive points along General Bell's civic governance line of effort. General Bell understood that, as he was fighting a guerrilla war with General Order #100 in effect, he had a responsibility to establish judicial and prison systems. General Bell was keenly aware of how the population openly and tacitly supported the guerrillas, and that they had previously captured and released men who turned out to be significant guerrilla leaders. In his introductory address to his leaders, General Bell described the procedures for prisons and the tracking of prisoners that he wanted used in the 3rd Separate Brigade. He was adamant that commanders knew whom they had imprisoned, both currently and previously. While this was probably for military intelligence purposes, General Bell also looked forward to the cessation of hostilities as this also has a civic role in tracking the population and ensuring that they released folks who deserved it at the end of hostilities.¹³⁹ During December 1901, General Bell directed that Provost Courts would be employed in order to try Filipinos who were accused of crimes or supporting the guerrillas. Additionally, if his commanders had sufficient evidence of their collusion with the guerrillas, they could charge and try local leaders and police chiefs by military commission.¹⁴⁰ General Bell formally organized the first Provost Court for the brigade on 28 December 1901. Expanded in January of 1902, the Provost Court could punish Filipinos found to be supporting the guerrillas. The courts could also try civilians for other offenses and levy punishments that included one thousand peso fines and up to 24 months in jail. To demonstrate the importance of the Provost

¹³⁹ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 38.

¹⁴⁰ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #3, 9 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 49.

Courts, General Bell placed many of his most capable officers as judges and in other key positions within this system.¹⁴¹

Drawing on his previous experience as a district commander, General Bell knew that he would have to provide for the reestablishment of civil governance and maintain a working municipal system in the interim. In order to do this, General Bell authorized his commanders to employ police, known to be loyal, to assist in maintaining order. He also instructed them to appoint officers to manage their civic duties of their towns, writing, “In case of necessity, commanding officers are authorized to appoint new municipal officials, or, in their discretion, to detail an officer or non-commissioned officer to conduct the affairs of the town. The taxes will be collected as usual and disbursed for the benefit of the pueblo.”¹⁴²

Once the fighting was over, General Bell quickly took steps towards the third decisive point of his civic governance line of effort, returning the provinces to civilian control. Under his direction, the 3rd Separate Brigade released most of their political prisoners, opened the secure zones, which allowed the local populace to move about freely and return to their original homes if they desired, and they opened the ports to trade.¹⁴³ After lifting almost all restrictions by mid May 1902, General Bell instructed his commanders that they must continue to supervise the collection and disbursement of taxes in the towns, and must provide oversight of the quarantine and sanitary

¹⁴¹ Linn, *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 155. See also General Order #5 of the 3rd Separate Brigade issued 28 December 1901 in *Affairs in the Philippine Islands: Hearings before the Committee on the Philippines of the United States Senate*, Volume 2, 1644.

¹⁴² BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #18, 23 December 1901, in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 64.

¹⁴³ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 268. See also correspondence between General Corbin, the Army’s Adjutant General, and General Chaffee in *Correspondence Relating to the War with Spain: Including the Insurrection in the Philippine Islands and the China Relief Expedition, April 15, 1898, to July 30, 1902*, Volume 2, 1335. On 3 May 1902, General Corbin asks General Chaffee when General Bell would allow the relocated civilians to return to their homes. General Chaffee responds within 48 hours, informing the Adjutant General that General Bell had allowed them to return home more than one month prior and that army surveillance on the Province had ceased as of 16 April 1902.

procedures emplaced to deal with the malaria. Believing that the situation was stable, General Bell directed that commanders charge any Philippine municipal authorities that were in place with carrying out all other government functions.¹⁴⁴

The fourth line of effort that General Bell conducted operations along was economics. While this was definitely a supporting effort, General Bell addressed it throughout the course of the campaign. In addition to ensuring that Filipinos were afforded the opportunity to work and be paid by the Army, General Bell directed his commanders to pay for any services or supplies that they receive from the local populace.¹⁴⁵

During the first month of the campaign, General Bell showed his appreciation of the economics in Batangas. He recognized that a key element of maintaining civil order was ensuring that the Filipinos maintained their established standard of living. In order to limit price gouging and enable this, on 23 December 1901, General Bell authorized his local commanders to regulate the price of food and other staples. The intent of this action was to prevent extortion and to maintain legal trade within each town.¹⁴⁶ As hostilities waned, General Bell also eased economic restrictions. In early April 1902, he authorized increases in the amounts of rice produced and transported. At the same time, ever cognizant of the potential for extortion, General Bell instructed his commanders to maintain control over the prices and closely supervise the transactions in order to prevent unscrupulous merchants from taking advantage of the local populace.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #38, 16 May 1902, in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 83.

¹⁴⁵ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 40.

¹⁴⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #16, 23 December 1901, in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 62.

¹⁴⁷ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #7, 7 April 1902, in, *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 82.

In Batangas, as is often the case, the elements of tempo, simultaneity, and depth were interrelated. U.S. Army doctrine defines Tempo as “the relative speed and rhythm of military operations over time with respect to the enemy.”¹⁴⁸ Commanders use depth, “the extension of operations in time space and resources,” to interrupt the enemy’s decision cycle. By conducting operations at multiple locations, a commander can force the enemy to distribute his combat power across his area of operations, preventing him from massing, or executing his own planned operations.¹⁴⁹ Simultaneity complements depth. Commanders employ it in combination with depth to extend operations in both time and space. In its simplest terms, simultaneity is conducting multiple tasks at the same time. These can be offensive, defensive, or stability tasks, or, most effectively, a combination of these. By conducting multiple types of operations at the same time, commanders disrupt their enemy’s decision cycle and force him to react to different events on different place in the operating environment at the same time.¹⁵⁰ General Bell employed all three of these elements of operational art in Batangas.

In December 1901, while conducting stability operations, such as relocating the civilian populace and securing food, and otherwise shaping his area of operations, the 3rd Separate Brigade also began conducting offensive operations against the guerrillas. During that month, General Bell began conducting counterguerrilla operations as he sought to seize the initiative and gather momentum that would carry forward into January. One of his cavalry troops, commanded by Captain John Hartman, conducted over 44 counterguerrilla operations that month, capturing 39 guerrillas and 100 weapons.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations* Change 1, 7-13.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 7-14.

¹⁵⁰ Department of the Army, Field Manual 3-0, *Operations* Change 1, 7-13.

¹⁵¹ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 254.

In order to maintain the speed and rhythm of counterguerrilla operations set by Captain Hartman and others in December, and to give the guerrillas little rest, General Bell deployed over 50% of his 8,000 men in the field hunting guerillas in January.¹⁵² The brigade's first expedition of 1902 set the tone and carried forth the momentum from December. Two units, commanded by Colonels Wales and Wint, deployed into the mountains around Lobo. Working in concert for most of the seven-day operation, they had several skirmishes with the enemy, killing several guerillas. More importantly the destroyed a huge amount of supplies, including over 1400 tons of rice, hundreds of bushels of corn, hundreds of head of livestock to include hogs, chickens, 800 cattle and 680 horse and destroyed 6,000 homes.¹⁵³ The 3rd separate Brigade maintained this tempo, following this operation up with three more expeditions designed to keep the pressure on the Guerillas and that over the course of January.¹⁵⁴

General Bell's men did not neglect their other operations during this time. While one-half of the brigade kept up the pressure on the guerrillas in the field, another 4,000 soldiers were conducting security and stability operation in the secured villages.¹⁵⁵ This simultaneity was a key element of General Bell's campaign plan. He knew that conducting sequential operations would be of little value and that to win decisively and most important, quickly, he had to keep Malvar's forces off balance. In his December 1901 letter to General Wheaton, Bell wrote that it would take two months after which there will be no more insurrection in his area of operations and "nothing

¹⁵² May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 254.

¹⁵³ BG J. Franklin Bell, "Annual Report of Operations in the 3rd 3rd Separate Brigade," in *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902*, p 190. See also *Affairs in the Philippine Islands: Hearings before the Committee on the Philippines of the United States Senate*, Volume 2, 1690-1699.

¹⁵⁴ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 256.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 254.

for the conspirators to negotiate about.”¹⁵⁶ By conducting counterguerrilla operations at the same time as he was isolating and securing the population, General Bell interrupted the guerrillas’ decision cycle. Fighting and moving constantly prevented the guerrillas from consolidating and reorganizing efficiently when they lost access to their supply base. These methods caused guerillas forces to collapse at several locations in the brigade’s area of operations. For example, while the main counterguerrilla effort was in Lobo, guerilla leaders and their men in Taal, Lipa, and Batangas City all surrendered to other elements of General Bell’s force that were garrisoning towns in those areas.¹⁵⁷

The final element of operational art that General Bell addressed was risk. In its discussion of operational risk, *Field Manual 3-0, Operations* states that effective commanders balance risk and opportunity. They seek to create opportunities or generate options for their force. Commanders can do this by accepting a risk and catching the enemy unawares by acting unexpectedly. By doing so, they are able to “create and maintain the conditions necessary to seize, retain, and exploit the initiative and achieve decisive results.”¹⁵⁸ In order to seize and retain the initiative in Batangas and to generate options for his subordinate commanders, General Bell addressed risk in two distinct areas. This first was mission accomplishment. General Bell understood that Malvar had time on his side and could afford to attempt to prolong the campaign. Thus ending the conflict expediently was a key element of General Bell’s endstate. He knew that he could not afford a prolonged conflict and that he had to create additional opportunities for his commanders in order to avoid this. General Bell did this by accepting risk and authorizing the employment of harsher methods than he would have liked. General Bell described his reasoning

¹⁵⁶ BG J. Franklin Bell to General Wheaton, 26 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 8.

¹⁵⁷ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 260.

¹⁵⁸ Department of the Army, *Field Manual 3-0, Operations Change 1*, 7-16.

for this in a letter to the Department of the North Philippines on 11 February 1902, writing, “halfway measures only tend to prolong the war, and vigorous measures were never more desirable, even though the war might be needed in time without them.”¹⁵⁹ By using the full range of force available to him under the Lieber Code, General Bell was able to create opportunities for victory that would otherwise have not been feasible. *Field Manual 3-0, Operations* states that a commander’s “willingness to accept risk is often the key to exposing enemy weaknesses that the enemy considers beyond friendly reach.”¹⁶⁰ This is exactly what General Bell did. He authorized the employment of harsher methods in order to extend his reach, fighting the guerrillas in ways and places that they did not expect. The success of General Bell’s campaign in Batangas rested upon his acceptance of a risk. To end the insurrection quickly, as his orders dictated, General Bell accepted the risks inherent in relocating the population to secured zones and employing harsher methods in dealing with the guerillas, believing that the opportunity for success was too great for him to pass up this opportunity.

General Bell was also concerned about the risk to his force if they took their license to employ extreme measure too far. Attuned to the possibilities for excesses and wanted to ensure that his men do not go too far, General Bell spent the month of January visiting his commanders in the field.¹⁶¹ These visits afforded him an opportunity to mitigate this risk by speaking with his commanders and their men face to face in order to ensure that his subordinates understood his orders and were carrying them out appropriately. Telegraphic Circular #3 also illustrates General Bell's understanding and acceptance of risk. In this directive General Bell addressed the risk

¹⁵⁹ BG J. Franklin Bell correspondence to Adjutant General, Department of the North Philippines, 11 February 1902, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 13.

¹⁶⁰ Department of the Army, *Field Manual 3-0, Operations Change 1*, 7-15.

¹⁶¹ BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #1, 6 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 45.

posed by a short and severe war as he believed that this was the surest path to victory, and in the long run would minimize hazards to his force, writing “A short and severe war creates in the aggregate less loss and suffering than benevolent war indefinitely prolonged.”¹⁶²

CONCLUSION

General J. Franklin Bell had a clearly developed understanding of the situation in Batangas. He also visualized a successful endstate and a path to achieve it. To create this path, and to describe it to his subordinates, General Bell demonstrated an understanding of the elements of operational art, which his memorandum and telegraphic circulars illustrate. These documents also provide a roadmap of how General Bell understood the elements of operational art and how that understanding contributed to the tactical actions that he directed in Batangas.

General Bell entered Batangas with a mandate to break the rebellion there and to do so quickly. He realized that Malvar’s guerrillas were the key to the rebellion and that to defeat the rebellion he had to defeat the guerrillas. General Bell also knew that the United States would have to work with the Filipino people after hostilities concluded as the United States’ strategic objective for the Philippines included a long-term presence and relationship.

General Bell understood how his tactical actions formed the foundation for this strategic objective. His December 1901 letter to General Wheaton, illustrates General Bell’s understanding of operational art. He succinctly informed his commander of what his force was trying to accomplish, ending the insurrection, and what conditions would signal the desired endstate. He described his concept for how his force would achieve this endstate, and how he had arranged his tactical actions in a sequence that would lead to it. General Bell also identified how he would

¹⁶² BG J. Franklin Bell, Telegraphic Circular #3, 9 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 46.

apply the resources he had at hand in order to accomplish his tactical actions, while maintaining an understanding of the risks he faced and how he could mitigate them to create opportunities.

General Bell began the Batangas campaign in December 1901 with a series of tactical actions that would enable him to focus his combat power on the guerrillas. He relocated the populace and secured the crops and supplies in the region. General Bell designed these two actions to cut the guerrillas lines of supply and lines of communication, thereby isolating their groups. The next tactical actions that General Bell directed were the raids designed to force the guerrillas away from the resettlements and supplies, actions designed to prevent them from interfering with the ‘civilian’ populace and further degrade their combat power.

General Bell’s appreciation for the strategic endstate also drove his other lines of effort. He directed tactical activities, such as providing civil governance, stimulating the economy, and providing medical care, that are not normally considered traditional military operations. The impetus for these non-traditional activities came from General Bell’s understanding of the Lieber Code. While seemingly at odds with some of the more harsh methods authorized by General Order #100, they were designed in order to protect a populace with which the United States needed or planned to build a long-standing relationship based on assimilating the populace, whether it is in confederate America or the 10,000 square miles of Batangas.

General Bell’s mission in Batangas was “to put an end to insurrection and re-establish peace in the shortest time practicable.”¹⁶³ The 3rd Separate Brigade’s campaign had enormous and swift effects on the guerrillas. Almost as soon as the campaign began, they saw the fruits of their activities. As General Bell’s brigade applied more and increasing pressure on the guerrillas in

¹⁶³ BG J. Franklin Bell address to officers of 3rd Separate Brigade, 1 December 1901, in *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*, 32.

their area of operations and provided security to the local populace, they saw an increase in support to their forces as well as an increase in the number of guerillas surrendering.¹⁶⁴

Within two months of starting the offensive of 1902, General Bell's actions had cut Malvar's lines of communication and forced him and the bulk of his force to abandon their plans and to devote most of their time on the run and in hiding.¹⁶⁵ Without access to their caches in the jungle, and with limited access to supplies, intelligence and other support from the now sequestered populace Malvar's guerrillas were not able to hold out for long. The numbers of guerrillas surrendering steadily increased into March, and culminated in early April when Malvar turned himself in to the Americans. General Chaffee cabled Washington D.C. on 16 April 1902, informing them that Malvar had surrendered to General Bell, and that "Organized armed resistance to United States terminated [in the] Department of North Philippines."¹⁶⁶

General Bell entered Batangas shaped by his time in the American west, and three years in the Philippines. Though well educated, having graduated from West Point and studied law at Southern Illinois University, General Bell had no formalized fundamental principles by which to guide his actions. In lieu of doctrine, he had professional journals, General Order #100, and his own personal experience. The United States had employed the "Instructions of the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field," in both the American Civil War and the Indian Wars. As used by General Bell in Batangas it provided for a balance between conciliation and repression in spirit and it formed the foundation for an informal but internationally accepted

¹⁶⁴ May, *Battle For Batangas: a Philippine Province at War*, 260.

¹⁶⁵ Headquarters Department of the North Philippines report to Secretary of War Elihu Root dated 15 April 1902, in *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902*, 237. See also Brian M. Linn, *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, 158.

¹⁶⁶ General Chaffee cable to General Corbin, the Army's Adjutant General in *Correspondence Relating to the War with Spain: Including the Insurrection in the Philippine Islands and the China Relief Expedition, April 15, 1898, to July 30, 1902*, Volume 2, 1327.

doctrine for pacification.¹⁶⁷ General Bell's employment of General Order #100 in the absence of doctrine went so well that it became doctrine. Not only was the Lieber Code included in the first edition of Army's *Field Service Regulations*, it comprised the entire chapter that provides instruction for the conduct of Army operations in time of war.¹⁶⁸

General Bell's campaign in Batangas also contributed to the evolution of the U.S. Army into a modern military. His campaign demonstrated that benevolence alone cannot defeat a determined enemy.¹⁶⁹ These lessons later served as a formula for U.S Army operations during the Cuban Intervention in 1906, and the Mexican Punitive Expeditions of 1916-1917.¹⁷⁰ General Bell played no small part in carrying these lessons to the service, first as the Commandant of the General Service and Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, and then from 1906-1910 as the Chief of Staff of the Army. During his tenure as the Chief of Staff, the Army enjoyed a period of relative peace allowing General Bell to focus his efforts on the reorganization and professionalization of the force.¹⁷¹ Finding that the first edition of the Army's *Field Service Regulations* was lacking, General Bell personally supervised its re-writing.¹⁷² His experience in the Philippines contributed to the inclusion of tactics, techniques and procedures for the employment of airplanes, machine guns, and bayonets in combat.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁷ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 9.

¹⁶⁸ U.S. War Department, *Field Service Regulations of the United States Army*, 195.

¹⁶⁹ Moyar, *A Question of Command*, 86. See also Andrew J Birtle, *US Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941*, 136.

¹⁷⁰ Birtle, *US Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941*, 171, 200.

¹⁷¹ Raines, "Major General J. Franklin Bell and Military Reform: The Chief of Staff Years, 1906-1910," 290.

¹⁷² Ibid., 474.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 398. General Bell also championed the need for physical training, having seen that at times commanders in the Philippines were unable to pursue the enemy as they were not in shape.

General Bell's campaign in Batangas provides many lessons that are as relevant today as they would have been to the leaders of the opening years of the last century. General Bell's campaign demonstrated how commanders have understood and used the elements of operational art in order to reach their objectives. General Bell's communications demonstrate that even without contemporary doctrine and education military leaders understood the importance of ensuring that their tactical actions were in pursuit of strategic aims.

Today's leaders in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom must consistently balance the conduct of offensive, defensive, and stability operations. They must simultaneously execute traditional military actions and non-military activities. However, these are not the first conflicts in which this occurred. In addition to providing an historical example of how commanders have previously had to conduct combat and stability operations simultaneously, study of the General Bell's campaign, and in fact the entire Philippine War, can offer great insight into the complexities of localized guerrilla war and indigenous resistance to foreign control. "As the most successful counterinsurgency campaign in U.S. history, it is the logical starting point for the systematic examination of military interventions, civic action, and pacification operations."¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁴ Linn, *The Philippine War 1899-1902*, 328.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abb, Madelfia A. *Bringing About a Military Learning Organization: The US Army in the Philippine War, 1899-1902.* monograph, Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army School of Advanced Military Studies, 2000.
- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. *Malagos: The Crisis of the Republic.* Quezon City, Philippines: The University of the Philippines, 1960.
- Asprey, Robert B. *War in the Shadows: The Guerrilla History.* New York: 1994, William Morrow & CO.
- Birtle, Andrew J. *US Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1860-1941.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2004.
- Bridgman, John M. "Thinking About War." In *War: A Historical, Political and Societal Study*, by L.L. Farrar Jr. Santa Barbara: American Bibliographical Center-Clio Press Inc, 1978.
- Bruno, Lieutenant Colonel Thomas A. "The Violent End of Insurgency on Samar 1901-1902." *Army History*, Spring 2011: 31-46.
- Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- De Toy, Brian M. *Turning Victory Into Success: Military Operations After the Campaign.* Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, 2004.
- Dolan, Ronald E., ed. *Philippines: A Country Study.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1993.
- Francisco, Luzviminda. "The Philippine-American War." In *The Philippines Reader*, edited by Daniel B. and Stephen R. Shalom Schirmer, 8-19. Boston: South End Press, 1987.
- Fuller, Major General J.F.C. BA. *Generalship: Its Diseases and Their Cure.* Harrisburg, PA: Military Service Publishing, 1936.
- Gates, John M. *Schoolbooks and Krags.* London: Greenwood Press, 1973.
- Grimsley, Mark. *The Hard Hand of War: Union Military Policy Toward Southern Civilians, 1861-1865.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Isserson, G.S. *The Evolution of Operational Art.* theoretical special edition. Translated by Dr. Bruce W. Menning. Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army School of Advance Military Studies, 2005.
- Joes, Anthony. "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines." In *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare*, edited by Daniel Marston and Carter Malkasian, 39-49. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2010.
- Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines.* New York: Random House, 1989.
- Kitson, General Sir Frank. *Low Intensity Operations: Subversion, Insurgency, and Peacekeeping.* St. Petersburg, FL: Hailer, 2005.
- LeRoy, James. *The Americans in the Philippines.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1914.

- Linn, Brian. *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2000.
- . *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Linn, Brian. "The US Army and Nation Building and Pacification in the Philippines." In *Armed Diplomacy: Two Centuries of American Campaigning*, 77-90. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, 2003.
- May, Glenn A. *Battle for Batangas: A Philippine Province at War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.
- McCoy, Alfred. *Policing America's Empire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- McDougall, Walter. *Promised Land, Crusader State: The American Encounter with the World Since 1776*. London: Mariner Books, 1998.
- Menning, Bruce W. "Operational Art's Origins." In *Historical Perspectives of the Operational Art*, edited by Michael D. Krause and R. Cody Phillips, 3-21. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2005.
- Miller, Stuart Creighton. *Benevolent Assimilation: The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Minger, Ralph. *William Howard Taft and United States Foreign Policy: The Apprenticeship Years 1900-1908*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1975.
- Morgan, H. Wayne. *America's Road to Empire: The War With Spain and Overseas Expansion*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- Moyar, Mark. *A Question of Command: Counterinsurgency from the Civil War to Iraq*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Naveh, Shimon. *In Pursuit of Military Excellence: The Evolution of Operational Theory*. New York: U.S. Naval Institute Press, 2002.
- Nelson, Harold W. "The Origins of Operational Art." In *Historical Perspectives of the Operational Art*, edited by Michael D. Krause and R. Cody Phillips, 333-347. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2005.
- Newell, Clayton R. "On Operational Art." In *On Operational Art*, edited by Clayton Newell and Michael Krause, 9-14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 1994.
- Parker, Geoffrey, ed. *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Warfare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Raines, Edgar F. Jr. "Major General J. Franklin Bell and Military Reform: The Chief of Staff Years, 1906-1910." PhD Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1976.
- Ramsey, Robert. *A Masterpiece of Counterguerrilla Warfare: BG J. Franklin Bell in the Philippines, 1901-1902*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, 2007.

- . *Savage Wars of Peace: Case Studies of Pacification in the Philippines, 1900-1902*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, 2007.
- Reardon, Carol Ann. "The Study of Military History and the Growth of Professionalism in the U.S. Army Before World War I." dissertation, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1987.
- Schirmer, Daniel B., and Stephen R. Shalom, ed. *The Philippines Reader: a History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship, and Resistance*. Boston: Souht End Press, 1999.
- Schneider, James J. "The Loose Marble-and the Origins of Operational Art." *Parameters* 19, no. 1 (March 1989): 85-99.
- . *The Theory of Operational Art*. Theoretical Paper No. 3, Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1988.
- . *Vulcan's Anvil: The American Civil War and the Foundation of the Operational Art*. Theoretical Paper No. 4, Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 2004.
- Silbey, David J. *A War of Frontier and Empire: The Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.
- Stewart, Richard W. "Occupations: Then and Now." In *Armed Diplomacy: Two Centuries of American Campaignin*, 267-280. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, 2003.
- Summers, Colonel Harold G. *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1982.
- Swain, Richard M. "Filling the Void: The Operational Art and the U.S. Army." In *Operational Art: Developments in the Theories of War*, 147-172. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.
- Taylor, John R.M. *History of the Philippine Insurrection Against the United States, 1899-1903*. Washington, D.C.: The National Archives of the United States, 1968.
- Thompson, Sir Robert. *Defeating Communist Insurgency: The Lessons of Malay and Vietnam*. St. Petersburg, FL: Hailer, 2005.
- Trask, David F. *The War with Spain in 1898*. New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1981.
- US Congress Senate Committee on the Philippines. *Affairs in the Philippine Islands: Hearings before the Committee on the Philippines of the United States Senate*. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902.
- US Department of Defense. *Joint Publication 1-02: Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2011.
- . *Joint Publication 3-0: Joint Operations*, Change 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008.
- US Department of the Army. "Army Doctrinal Publication 3-0, Unified Land Operations; Pre-decisional draft version 9.6." Unpublished working paper, 2011.
- . *Field Manual 100-5: Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 1986.

- . *Field Manual 100-5: Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1993.
- . *Field Manual 3-0: Operations, Change 1*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 2011.
- . *Field Manual 3-0: Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2001.
- . *Field Manual 3-0: Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008.
- . *Field Manual 3-07: Stability Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2008.
- . *Field Manual 3-24: Counterinsurgency*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2006.
- . *Field Manual 5-0: Army Planning and Orders Production, Change 1*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 2011.
- . *Field Manual 6-0: Mission Command: Command and Control of Army Forces*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 2003.

US War Department. *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902.

- . *Correspondence Relating to The War with Spain: Including the Insurrection in the Philippine Islands and the China Relief Expedition, April 15, 1898, to July 30, 1902*. Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902.
- . *Field Service Regulations of the United States Army*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905.
- . *Field Service Regulations of the United States Army*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910.
- . *Field Service Regulations of the United States Army*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914.

Vetock, Dennis J. *Lessons Learned: A History of U.S. Army Lesson Learning*. Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army Military History Institute, 1988.

Welch, Richard E. *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Wolff, Leon. *Little Brown Brother*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1960.